

4227 *Speculum Clarkianum:*

O R,

Cl--k against *Cl--k*.

Being a

CONFUTATION

OF HIS

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity,

Out of his own previous Writings.

By PHILOTRIADOS. *K*

St. Chrysostom observes concerning the ancient Hereticks, That tho' their Opinions were never so widely different both from the Truth and from each other, yet every one pretended that his particular Opinion was agreeable to the Scripture, and founded in it; and that all different Opinions were discountenanced by it, and might be confuted out of it: He observes also farther that the true Reason of this their Confidence was, because every one pick'd out of the Scripture all those Passages; which, according to the letter and sound of the Words, seem'd to favour his particular Opinion, without regarding their coherence and connection, or the Occasion and Design of their being written: Thus from those Passages which speak of CHRIST as a Man, and in his State of Humiliation, some were so unreasonable as to collect, that he was but meer Man, and so deny'd his Divinity, &c. Preface to Dr. Cl--k's three practical Essays, &c. page 1.

Every Kingdom divided against itself is brought to Desolation; and every City or House divided against itself shall not stand. Mat. 12.25.

London, Printed for W. MEARS, at the Lamb without Temple-bar. 1714. Price 6d.



PRINTED BY

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. N. Y. C.



THE BRITISH MUSEUM

ROYAL COAT OF ARMS

1851

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

ROYAL COAT OF ARMS

1851

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

ROYAL COAT OF ARMS

1851

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

ROYAL COAT OF ARMS

1851

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

ROYAL COAT OF ARMS

1851

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

ROYAL COAT OF ARMS

1851



THE PREFACE.

IT was observ'd, by a * Divine of our Church, that tho' Socinus denied the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour, yet he acted the Part of a Philosopher, and was consistent with himself: But Dr. Cl—k, who pretends to the greatest Exactness and Nicety in Philosophy, and in every Enquiry of that nature, carries all before him with a loud *Euphonia*, in Divinity comes far short of that Character; for, his Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, and his Boyle's Lectures, and his Paraphrases on the Evangelists, are contradictory and self-inconsistent. In the last two, he asserts the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, in the first he denies it; in these he joyns with the Orthodox, in that he closes in with Arrius and Sabellius: For, † *Quis ante sacrilegum Arrium, Trinitatis Unitatem discindere, Quis ante scelera- tum Sabellium Unitatis Trinitatem confundere ausus est?* Whether or no he did this to serve a Turn, and help a banish'd || Brother out at a dead list; or,

A 2

Car-

* *Egit Philosophum, hoc est, sibi constat, sibi congruit, & quàmvis falsa, tamen coherētia docet. Robasham. Disquisit. Hypoth. Baxterian. † Vincentius Linnenfis. || Whiston.*

Carneades like, to shew his Faculty of confuting all manner of positive Assertions, I dare not say; but this I affirm, That he who thus plays with the Divine Nature, may one day feel his Vengeance in good earnest.

The Doctor seems, in his Introduction to his Script. Doctr. of the Trinity, p. 27, to decline the Name of a Sabellian, Arrian, or Socinian; but however he may dislike those Names, 'tis too plain he doth not dislike the Doctrine belonging to them; for, who that was not espousing the Socinian Cause, would treat the Scriptures and the Liturgy at that abominable rate as he has done? In the former he has rang'd Texts against Texts (in order, as he says, to shew their true meaning) in such a manner, as that one would be sooner apt to conclude they had no meaning at all, than be able (from him) to tell what was their true one: In the latter he has expounded away all those places which relate to the *ὕμωσις*, or Unity of Essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: In both he has planted all his Forces against that great Article of our Faith, the ever-blessed Trinity, with but little regard (I am sorry to say it) either to Truth or Sincerity; as any one of but an ordinary Capacity, that has read his Book, may easily perceive: For some places that relate to the Son as God, he has construed with reference to the Father; as * Jude 4. Tit. 2. 13. 2 Pet. 1. 1. 1 Joh. 5. 20, &c. Others that speak him consubstantial with the Father, he has commented quite away; as, Joh. 10. 30. Rom. 14. 11, 12, &c. He has tilted (as a † learned Author says upon the same thing) Texts against Texts, which seem mutually to destroy each other. In one Chapter he brings you Passages, wherein he is stiled God; in another, wherein 'tis declar'd that the World was made by him; in a third, wherein the highest Titles and Perfections are ascrib'd to him, &c. Afterwards he quotes

you

* See Dr. Hammond.
Deacon of Wells.

† The Reverend Mr. Hill, Arch-

you Passages, wherein the Son is declar'd to be Subordinate to the Father; which tho' they relate to him as Man, or as God-Man, yet he puts them upon an equal footing with those that refer to his Godhead: And indeed, in those places which concern his Godhead, he is very cautious and tender how he lets them prove too much; and endeavours by all the mollifying Comments to soften their Sense, and expunge their Divinity; and 1 Joh. 5. 7, where he cannot soften the Sense, he would fain expunge the Verse; but, for its being genuine, I refer the Reader to the learned Dr. Hammond, and Millii Examen in locum. And lest, after he has subverted the Sense of the New, there should still remain a sufficient Proof of a Trinity in Unity, and an Unity in Trinity, in the Old Testament, he endeavours to subvert the Sense of that also, by saying, p. 304. § 33. That the word God in Scripture never signifies a complex Notion of more Persons than One, but always means One Person only, &c. Sure the Doctor understands not the Scriptures! If he doth, he acts very unfairly, and very treacherously; for the word God, in the very first place where we meet with it, viz. Gen. 1. 1. is of a complex signification, as we may learn from the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים, where the word Elohim, which we translate God, is of the plural Number, and Bara, created, of the singular; and yet, forsooth, this great Doctor positively affirms, that the word God is never of a complex signification! But we must forgive him, for he is reviving the Arrian Heresie; and I wish, whilst he is doing of that, he doth not revive Atheism too; for when the Scriptures are made to contradict themselves, what must be the Event, but that their Authority be first question'd, then disown'd, and at last the Religious Toke quite cast-off. Far be it from me to say, or think, that Dr. Cl—k has any Design to promote Atheism or Deism; but this I say, the Steps he has taken to shew the Holy Ghost inferiour

to the Son, and both to the Father, tend very much that way.

P. 26. of *Introduct. &c.* the Doctor says, To let alone Philosophical Enquiries concerning the Metaphysical Nature and Substance of each of the three Persons in the ever-blessed Trinity, is more for the Peace of the Catholick Church, and the Simplicity of the Christian Faith; and yet he affirms dogmatically, that the word *ὑποστάσις* as signifying [not one Substance, but] one Essence strictly and metaphysically taken, cannot be true: And afterwards, in the same Page, he interprets the word *ὑποστάσις* according to the plainer and less metaphysical (metaphysical tho') Expressions and Notions of Scripture, that the Son is the Image of the Invisible God. Now, besides that according to himself he has render'd this part of his Discourse needless, and disturbing to the Quiet of the Church, he betrays either his Judgment or Integrity, in his translating of the Greek word *ὑποστάσις*.

I wish the Doctor would begin to consider the Oath that he took when he was admitted to his Doctor's Degree at Cambridge, which he sets down p. 14; where he swears from his Heart to receive the whole Sacred Canonical Scriptures, &c. to hold or reject all that the True, Holy, and Apostolical Church — holds or rejects. Which how he has done, the whole World is a Judge.

To put a stop therefore to the Prejudices which may be suck'd in against the Trinity, and the Scriptures themselves, from a Book indited by so great a Man as Dr. Cl—k is acknowledg'd to be, and to preserve the Minds of less-discerning People from being tainted with his plausible Performance, I have in the following Sheets compar'd the Doctrine laid down in his sixteen Sermons preach'd at the Honourable Mr. Boyle's Lectures, and in his Paraphrases on the four Evangelists, with his Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, and shew'd them

The PREFACE.

V

to be inconsistent and contradictory to each other: I have also here and there, by the By, shew'd him to be inconsistent with himself within the compass of that last Book, and have given the Reader a Specimen or two of his Partiality and Prejudice against the Trinity; hoping the World will, after this, take him by the best Handle, or none at all. His own Words, which I refer to, either in his Boyle's Lectures or Paraphrases, &c. are mark'd with the Letters a, b, c, d, &c. The Passages in his Scripture-Doctrine, which I quote, are mark'd with the same Numbers as they stand in the Book, so that the Reader for his satisfaction may easily turn to 'em.

But it may be ask'd what occasion there was for my meddling with this Piece of his, when 'tis so fully and learnedly confuted by great and able Pens already: To this I answer in the Words of a very eminent * Divine; It is useful that the same Questions should be handled by several Persons, after a different Method, tho' according to the Principles of the same Faith, that so the Explication of Difficulties, and the Arguments for the Truth, may come to the Knowledge of every one, either one way or other. They have skew'd him to be in the wrong as to the Controversie he is engag'd in; I have shew'd him to be inconsistent with himself; and tho' mine may not be equal to the establishing of the Trinity, yet I trust it may be of some service to the overthrowing of those Arguments which he has advanc'd against it: For, who will credit that Man who will not stand to what he says, but gives himself to play fast and loose, and to trip in every Reach?

But, after all, Dr. Cl—k has wrote some things very orthodoxly, and very learnedly, for which the World is oblig'd to him; and therefore I am for observing the same Rule with him as Dr. Jenkins doth with St. Austin, *Sejuncto ab Errore pietatem; hanc veneror, illum rejicio.*

4 OC 58

AXIOMS.

Richardson, in his Canon of the N. Test. vindic.

AXIOMS.

1. **T**HE Word of G O D is true.
2. The Scriptures are the Word of G O D, and therefore true.
3. Both parts of an Affirmative and Negative of the same Thing cannot be true; therefore,
4. The Scriptures do not affirm and deny the same Thing of the same Person.
5. The Scriptures affirm the Son to be consubstantial and equally G O D with the Father; therefore,
6. Where they seem to speak him subordinate and inferiour to the Father, they must be understood either as relating to his Theanthropy or Humanity.

Speculum

Speculum Clarkianum, &c.

I*F any Man (says St. Paul) preach any other Gospel unto you than that you have receiv'd, let him be accursed, Gal. 1. 8.* But here is a Doctor (of no mean Character in the Church) who has lately alarm'd the World, not only with another Gospel contrary to that you have receiv'd; (and, I hope, to what you will always firmly adhere) but also contrary to what he himself has formerly taught you.

The Unity of God, is an Unity of Nature or^s Essence: — as to the Diversity of Persons in the ever-blessed Trinity; that is, whether notwithstanding the Unity of the Divine Nature, there may not co-exist with the first supreme Cause, such excellent Emanations from it, as may themselves be really Eternal, Infinite, and Perfect by a compleat communication of Divine Attributes in an incomprehensible manner; always excepting Self-origination, Self-existence, or absolute Independency: Of this, I say, as there is nothing in bare Reason, by which it can be demonstrated that there is actually any such thing; so neither is there any Argument, by which it can be prov'd impossible or unrea-
B
sonable

sonable to be suppos'd: and therefore, * so far as declared and made known to us by clear Revelation, it ought to be believ'd. *Demonstrat. of the Being and Attrib. of God*, by S. Cl—k, D. D. p. 51.

That

* So far as declared and made known, &c.] No more than this do we desire, and if the Dr. would but stick to this, *assum esset de controversiâ*: for the Scriptures plainly discover to us a Trinity in Unity, and an Unity in Trinity; as, *Genes. 1. 1. In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth*, **אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא**, where the word *Elohim*, God, of the plural Number, shews a plurality of Persons, and *Bara*, created, of the singular, an Unity of Godhead. *Gen. 1. 26. And God said, Let US make Man in OUR Image*; where the Verb of the plural Number shews a plurality of Persons; and the word *God*, of the singular, an Unity of Essence; where the Pronoun *Our* of the plural Number shews a plurality of Persons; and the words following, *So God created Man in his Own Image*, where the Pronoun is of the singular Number, an Unity of Essence. *Gen. 3. 22. And the Lord God said, Behold the Man is become as one of US.* *Gen. 11. 7. Let US go down, &c.* *Gen. 18. 1, 2, 3. When Abraham sat in his Tent door in the Plains of Mamre, in the heat of the Day, 'tis said the Lord appear'd unto him, and he lift up his Eyes and look'd, and lo, three Men stood by him; and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the Tent-door, and bowed himself toward the Ground, and said, My Lord, if now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee.* Here you see Three appear'd, but Abraham speaks to them but as One; nay, the Text itself makes them but One, for 'tis said, *the LORD appear'd, וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים*, in the singular Number. *Isa. 6. 8. Also I heard the Voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send? See the Unity of Essence; And who will go for US? See the plurality of Persons.* *Chap. 6. 3. Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts, &c.* This is call'd the *ἁγιωσύνη καὶ τριότης τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and is interpreted by Athanasius, p. 154, 155. by Epiphanius in *Ancorat. 1. 26. Ambrose, lib. 2, cap. 4. de Fide. Fulgentius Lib. de Fide ad Petrum Diaconum, cap. 1, &c.* of a Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Godhead. And, *1 Job. 5. 7. There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One: ὁ θεὸς ὁ λόγος, One and the same Thing; One in Nature, Essence, and Power.*

That this Supreme, Self-existent Cause, b
and Father of all Things, did before all
Ages, in an incomprehensible manner, ge-
nerate a Divine Person, or Emanation,
from himself, stiled the *Logos*, the *Word* or
Wisdom, or *Son of God*; God of God, in
whom dwells the Fulness and Perfection of
all Divine Attributes, excepting only that
of absolute Independency or Self-origina-
tion, being the Image of the Invisible God,
the Brightness of his Father's Glory, and
the express Image of his Person; having
been in the beginning with God, Partaker
with him of his Glory before the World
was; the Upholder of all things by the
Word of his Power, and himself ever all,
(by communication of his Father's Glory)
God, blessed for ever: This Doctrine (I say)
tho' not indeed discoverable by bare Rea-
son; yet, when made known by Revela-
tion, appears plainly very consistent with
right Reason, and ('tis manifest) contains
nothing that implies any manner of Absur-
dity or Contradiction in it. *The Evid. of Nat.*
and Rev. Relig. by S. Cl—k, D. D. p. 246.

Now the same that is said of the Son, c
may in like manner with little variation
be, very agreeably to right Reason, under-
stood concerning the Original Procession of
the Holy Spirit from the Father. *Id. p. 249.*

Mark 13. 32. *But of that Day and that d*
Hour knows no Man; no, not the Angels which
are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Fa-
ther.

'Ours i i d s must signifie one of these two Paraphrase
things; either that the Human Nature of by Dr. Cl—k

Christ knew not the precise time, or else that he was not commission'd to reveal it. The former seems the most easie Explication, it being said expressly in other places of Scripture, that Christ, *i. e.* his Human Soul, encreas'd in Wisdom and Knowledge by degrees; as he is also said to be exalted in Power, *Phil.* 2. 9.

e *Joh.* 1. 1. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

Paraphr.
by Dr. Cl.

With God the Father therefore, the first supreme Cause and Original of all things, there co-existed from all Eternity, in the Unity of the same Infinite Essence, that Divine Person, who is stiled the *Word* or *Wisdom* or *Son of God*, being an eternal Emanation from the Father, of the same Nature and Substance with himself, the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person.

f *Ver.* 2. *The same was in the beginning with God.*

Paraphr.
by Dr. Cl.

This Divine Person (I say) co-existed with God the Father, not only before his appearance upon Earth, but also before the Creation of the visible World, even from all Eternity.

g *Ver.* 16. *And of his Fulness have we all received, &c.*

Paraphr.
by Dr. Cl.

— by that infinite Fulness of Divine Perfections which dwelt in him.

Joh.

Joh. 3. 32. *And what he hath seen and heard, b
that he testifieth.*

The things which he teaches, he not only Paraphr.
by Dr. Cl. knows certainly and infallibly to be true, but also understandeth them throughly by his own Divine Knowledge, coming himself immediately from God, having in himself the Fulness of all Perfections, and revealing things according to his own pleasure.

Ver. 34. *For he whom God hath sent, &c.*

For, as he came properly from Heaven, Paraphr.
by Dr. Cl. in such a manner as no Prophet ever did, so he also speaks the Word of God in such a manner, as no other ever did; not having supernatural Endowments conferr'd upon him in a limited measure, as the Prophets had, but possessing all Knowledge and all Perfections absolutely in himself.

Joh. 5. 23. *That all Men should honour the k
Son, even as they honour the Father.*

All which things plainly shew, that it is Paraphr. the Mind and Will of God the Father, that the Son should be honour'd with the same Faith and Obedience, which he requires to be paid to himself.

NB. This indeed is Dr. Claget's Exposition; but Dr. Cl——k, by quoting it, has made it his own.

Joh. 10. 30. *I and my Father are one.*

As in Nature, so also in Power and Paraphr.
by Dr. Cl. Will.

THE

THE

Scripture-Doctrine of the TRINITY.

Chap. I. Of God the Father.

- N^o 1. **M**ATT. 19. 17. *Why callest thou me Good? There is none Good, but One, [Eis, One Person] that is God.*

This Text the Dr. brings to prove that the Father is the *One* or *Only* God, exclusive of the Son; for (says he, according to his new Divinity) neither can the word *God*, or any other word than that of *Person*, be understood in this place; but if it proves this, it proves also that the Son is not so much as *good*, and then 'tis contrary to his Doctrin at *a*, to his Paraphrase on *Jeh. 3. 32*, at *b*; and on *v. 34*, at *i*.

2. Mark 12. 29. *The first of all the Commandments is; Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.*

This, as excluding the Son, is contrary to *a*, *b*, *c*, and *l*.

6. Rom. 3. 30. *Seeing it is One God, which, &c.*

See his Doctrin at *a*, *b*, *c*, and *l*.

9. Gal. 3. 20. but God is One.

By

By this *One* the Dr. understands *One Person*, and so shuts the *Son* out from any share in the Godhead; but this sence of it is contrary to his Exposition on *Joh. 1. 1.* at *e*, and on *Joh. 10. 3.* at *l*, and to all his 2d Chap. § 1. of the *Son*, where he brings no less than thirteen Texts to prove the *Son God*; three of which, *viz.* 2 *Pet. 1. 1.* 1 *Joh. 3. 16.* & 5. 20. he is so very inconsistent with himself, as to make serve both to prove, that the Father alone is (properly speaking) *God*, and that the Son is *God* too: As any one may see, by comparing N^o 289, 293 & 410 of the *Script. Doctr.* with N^o 543, 544, & 545 of the same. Thus dextrous is the Doctor at ringing of Changes!

*Ephes. iv. 4, 5, 6. There is — one Spi- 10.
rit, — one Lord, — One God and Fa-
ther of all, who is above all.*

This Text the Doctor manages very singularly. He brings in his Hyphens, and prints *One God and Father* in different Characters, *αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς* (I suppose) thereby to exclude the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* of the Godhead; but let him look back to *c* compar'd with *b*, and to *e* and *l*, and he'll find himself of another mind.

1 *Tim. 1. 17. The only wise God.*

If this proves what the Doctor would have 11.
it, *viz.* that the Father is the *One* or *Only God*,
it proves that the Son is *not wise*; which is
contrary to what he has laid down at *b*, at *e*,
at *b* and *i*; and to the Texts he has cited
N^o 566, 625, & 644.

1 *Tim.*

13. 1 Tim. 6. 15, 16. *The blessed and only Potentate, — who only has Immortality.*

This Text can prove nothing what the Doctor designs it should, if he allows the Son to be *blessed* and a *Potentate*; which he doth under the Letter *b*, at N^o 539, 615, 620, & 622.

14. Jam. 11. 19. *Thou believest that there is one God, [Gr. ὁ ὁ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν; that God is one;] thou doest well.*

The Doctor would do well too, if he would believe that there is *one God*, as the Jews did; for they believing in *one God*, did not understand thereby *one Person*, (as the Dr. would fain have it here): for 'tis plain, from *Moses* and the Prophets Writings that they believ'd a *Trinity of Persons* in an *Unity of Essence*, tho' they could not be perswaded that the second Person in the Trinity was come among them. And sure the Doctor, by confining *One God* to the Person of the Father only, has forgot his Paraphrase at *e* and *l*; where he gives a Place to the *Son* in the *Unity* of the *Infinite Essence* of the *Father*; which see.

17. Rev. 15. 4. *For Thou only art Holy, [Gr. ὁ μόνος ὁ ἅγιος,] &c.*

See his Lectures at *b*, his Paraphrase at *g* and *i*; and *Acts* 3. 14, 15. which he quotes N. 615, as an Instance of the highest Titles being ascrib'd to the *Son*, where the Article prefix'd τὸν ἅγιον, *The Holy One*, — τὸν ἀρχόντα, *The Prince*, &c; I take to be as emphatical as μόνος; and so, if one must be confin'd to the Person of the Father by way of Eminence, the

the other must be confin'd to the Person of the Son by way of Eminence, and so they will necessarily destroy each other. Thus Dr. Cl—.

§ 2.
Mark 3. 35. *The Will of God, [of my 24.]*
FATHER, Mat. 12. 50.]

We will grant that the word *God* in this place signifies the *Person* of the *Father*, as he has explain'd it by *Mat. 12. 50.* yet how doth he argue from this the Supremacy of the *Father*, (which is his Design, as one may see from the Title of the Section;) when he says upon *Joh. 10. 3.* that the *Son* is *one* with the *Father*; as in Nature, so also in Power and Will? Which see at *l.*

Luk. 2. 52. *Jesus entreated — in Fa- 28.*
vour with GOD and Man.

Wisdom, Stature, and Favour are here *dr-
deartrn!@ dnyhadla*, Indications of his *Huma-
nity*, and are to be understood *as' d'geartiv
Luxw*, with respect to his Human Soul; as he himself says on *Mar. 13. 32.* at *d*; and then a mighty thing indeed, that the *Father* should be Supreme over the *Son* as Man! but any thing to serve a Turn!

Joh. 1. 1, 2. *The Word was with GOD. 33.*
— *The same was in the beginning with GOD.*

This Text in no wise proves the *Father* superiour to the *Son*, (which the Dr. would have it) if he will but stand to his own Paraphrase on it; which see at *e.*

37. Joh. 3. 17. *GOD sent his Son.*

38. Joh. 3. 34. *He, whom GOD hath sent.*

From the Son's being *sent* the Dr. would infer his Inferiority to the *Father*; but his Paraphrase on the latter of these two Verses, speaks quite the contrary; which see at *i*.

41. Joh. 5. 18. *But said also that GOD was his Father, making himself equal with GOD.*

I am sorry to find the Rector of St. James, a *professed* Christian, should have a worse notion of this Expression than the *Jews* had; for they certainly thought that Christ, by saying God was his *Father*, made himself his *Son* in such a manner, as render'd himself equal to God in Nature; but he thinks that Christ's calling God his *Father* bespeaks him subordinate to him; but this is contrary to what he has laid down at *e*, unless the same thing can be inferior to its self: which, I believe, he upon second thoughts, will scarce grant.

44. Joh. 6. 29. *This is the Work of GOD, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.*

See his Paraphrase, at Letter *e*.

48. Joh. 8. 40. *The Truth, which I have heard of GOD.*

From this the Dr. would argue the *Son* subordinate to the *Father*, because he says *he heard the Truth, of God*; but this is inconsistent with his Paraphrase on Joh. 3. 32. which see at *h*.

Joh.

- Joh. 14. 2. *In my FATHER's House, &c.* 53.
 Joh. 16. 28. *I came forth from the Fa-* 54.
ther, &c.
 Joh. 20. 17. *I ascend unto my FATHER,* 55.
&c.
 Acts 2. 33. — *And having received* 60.
of the FATHER, &c.

From the *διδομεν* or Filiation express'd in these Texts, the Dr. would infer the Son's Subordination to the Father, καὶ τὸν θεόν, with respect to his God-head: But tho' the first Person in the Trinity be the Father to the second, and therefore καὶ ὁ ἀρχαῖος superior; yet as the learned Bishop Pearson observes, καὶ ὁ υἱός, in their Nature they are both equal, and neither before or after the other. And this the great Dr. himself (however his Mind is alter'd now) has more than once asserted; as the Reader may see, by looking back to the Letters *a, b, c,* and *l.*

Acts 4. 24, 30. *They lift up their Voice to* 65.
GOD, saying, Lord, thou art GOD; —
grant that — Wonders may be done by the
Name of thy Holy Child Jesus.

Grant that] Here is a Concession indeed; but such a one, as beats down the Authority of the Son, and reduces him into the rank of Servants acting under their Lord, as himself explains it N^o 869. The Dr. here acts the Socinian's Cause under a very artful disguise; he patches two Verses together, and seems to stickle so strongly for the Son, that if you will but allow him to be able to work Wonders, he'll compound with you for his God-
 C 2 head,

head, and resign that over to the *Father*: For what else can any Man think that he intends by this piece of Patch-work, but to make the *Father* alone *God*, and allow the *Son* the Power only of working Miracles under him? But, good Doctor, because the *Father* is *God*, can't the *Son* therefore be *God*? But I think I need not ask you that Question; for you have told me in several places, that he is *God*; nay and more, that he is *equal God with the Father*; as at *a*, at *b*, at *c* and *l*. And therefore this piece of Patch-work of yours must fall in pieces.

66. Acts 5. 3, 4. — to lie to the Holy Ghost. — *Thou hast not lyed unto Men, but unto G O D.*

The rankest *Socinian* could not expound this place worse; for he has explain'd away the Personality of the *Holy Ghost*, and made it no more than a Power or Operation of the *Father*: But let the Reader compare his Notes upon it with what he has said at *c*, compar'd with *b*, and with what he says p. 292, § xxii, and he will find him to be of another mind.

74. Acts 10. 38. — for G O D was with him.

From hence the Doctor infers, that the *Father* is Superior to the *Son*, because he is said to assist him with his Power; but this is contradicting his Exposition on *Joh. 1. 1.* where he says, they were also together in the Unity of Essence; which see at *e*.

108. Rom. 8. 3. G O D sending his Son.

See his Paraphrase, under the letter *i*.

Rom.

Rom. 15. 6. *GOD even the Father of* 118.
our Lord Jesus Christ.

See his Paraphrase under the letters *e* & *l*.

2 Cor. 4. 4. *Christ, who is the Image of* 158.
GOD.

See under the letter *e*.

Gal. 4. 4. *When the fulness of time was* 177.
come, GOD sent forth his Son.

See his Paraphrase under *i*.

Ephes. 1. 1. *Paul an Apostle of Jesus* 182.
Christ, by the Will of GOD.

By this Text the Doctor would have the World believe, that St. Paul was appointed an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the Will of the Father only; and that there was no act of Jesus Christ's own Will in the appointment, and that therefore the Father must be Superior to the Son: But most certainly he is out in his Calculation; for if the Will of Two be numerically the same, then what one wills consequently the other does: That the Will of the Father and the Son is numerically the same, we have his own Words in his Paraphrase on Joh. 10. 3, which see at *l*.

Ephes. 6. 6. *As the Servants of Christ,* 198.
doing the Will of GOD.

Vid. ut supra.

See Note above, under 182.

211.

1 Tim.

244. 1 Tim. 2. 5. *For there is ONE GOD, and ONE Mediatour between GOD and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.*

How unfairly doth the Doctor act here! he brings this Place as a Proof of the *Father's* Supremacy, in an absolute, which is only true in a limited Sence; viz. as the *Son* is consider'd with respect to his Theanthropy, or Mediatourship: for abstract the Divinity from the Humanity of the *Son*, and there is still but *One God*, tho' the *Son* be *God*; and this he himself has asserted in his *Boyle's Lectures*, at *a*; in his Paraphrase on *St. John*, at *e* & *l*.

252. Tit. 1. 2. — *which GOD, that cannot lie, promised —*

If this proves the Supremacy of the *Father*, it proves that the *Son* can lie; and then where are all those divine Perfections, which the Doctor has asserted to be in him, at *b*, *g*, *h*, and *i*?

270. Heb. 10. 7. *Lo, I come (in the Volume of the Book it is written of me) to do thy Will, O GOD.*

See his Paraphrase on *Joh. 10. 3.* at *l*.

292. 1 Joh. 1. 5. *GOD is Light, and in him is no Darknefs at all.*

See his *Boyle's Lectures*, at *b*.

331. Rev. 19. 13. *And his Name is called, the Word of GOD.*

From hence the Doctor infers the *Father's* Supremacy over the *Son*; but that this Word is

is of the very same Nature and Essence with the *Father* and equally *God*, see himself explaining it on *Joh. 1. 1. at e.*

§ 3.

Mat. 15. 31. *They glorified the God of Israel.* 338.

The Doctor is so unreasonable as to confine the *God of Israel* to the Person of the *Father* only; when 'tis certain that that *God of Israel*, was the same with the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. Now that the *Son* was their *God*, we see him so explaining the 31st and 32d Verses of *Acts 7*, at N^o 616.

Matt. 19. 17. *Why callest thou me Good? &c.* 340.

See Note under N^o 1. of this Book.

Joh. 17. 3. *And this is Life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and [that they might know] Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* 355.

This, Dr. *Whitby* observes, is but *καὶ ὁ ἀντιπαρὶ τῆς πολυθείας*, in opposition to Polytheism; and had the Doctor been writing against the Heathen Idolatry, the Text had been proper enough; but to exclude the other Persons 'tis of no force at all: for, besides that, the same learned Commentator observes that the words are not *οὐ μόνον τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*, but *οὐ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*; and, that the *Son* too is call'd *ἀληθινὸς Θεός* himself. By this Interpretation he has contradicted what he has said at *b, e, and l*; which see.

Acts

356. Acts 3. 13. *The GOD of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the GOD of our Fathers, has glorified his Son JESUS.*

How unfair is it from the Humanity of the *Son*, to impose upon the World a disbelief of his Divinity! For that *Jesus* here is to be understood, as being *Man* and not *God*, is plain from his own Comments on Acts 7. 31, 32, at Numb. 616, where the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* was Christ. So that unless the Dr. will allow of two *Gods*, Christ the *Son* is God, and equal with the *Father*; for if there is any inequality between them, then they are distinct Beings, and consequently distinct *Gods*.

—pudet hæc! —

362. Acts 15. 8. *GOD which knoweth the Hearts.*

Here the Dr. tells you, that to know the *Hearts* is a Peculiar of God the *Father's*; but if so, let him reconcile this place with his Quotations at N^o 557 & 565, which he brings as Instances of the highest Perfections and Powers being ascrib'd to the *Son*.

367. Rom. 1. 23. *The Glory of the Uncorruptible God.*

Uncorruptible here, forsooth, is printed in a different Character, to shew (as much as possible) that 'tis a Property belonging to God the *Father* alone; but if the *Son* co-exists in the Unity of the same Infinite Essence with the *Father*, which he asserts at the letter *e*, then I can't conceive how *Uncorruptible* can be any more a Property peculiar to the *Father*, than
to

to the Son. Besides, he himself expressly allows the Son to be blessed for Ever at *b*; and if so, then he is uncorruptible.

Rom. 16. 26. According to the Commandment of the Everlasting God. 375.

See *b*, *e*, and *f*.

Rom. 16. 27. To God only wise, &c. 376.

See *b*, *e*, *h*, and *i*.

2 Cor. 6. 18. Saith the Lord Almighty; [Gr. Παντοκράτωρ, Supreme over All.] 380.

Ephes. 4. 6. Who is above All. 382.

These Texts the Dr. would have understood of the Person of the Father only, exclusive of the Son, and so make the Son a Subject, or Subordinate Being; But if these Epithets speak the Father the only supreme God, by a parity of Argument the same Epithets should speak the Son the only supreme God. Now, that the same Epithets are given to the Son, see his Quotations at N^o 620 & 621 *.

Besides, I would fain ask this great Man, how the Father can be Supreme over all exclusive of the Son, when the Father and the Son are both One; as he himself says in his Paraphrase on Joh. 1. 1. at *e*.

Col. 1. 15. Who [Christ] is the Image of the Invisible God, the first born of every Creature.

D

I should

I should be at a loss how to answer all the Dr's forced and crude Interpretations of the Scriptures, had not he been so kind as to have put Answers into my Mouth. As here, he would have the World believe that this Image, which is *Christ*, is inferior to the Person it represents, which is *the Invisible God*. Now, for a satisfaction in this point, whether the thing be so or no, I refer the Reader to his own words at *b* and *c*.

388. 1 Tim. i. ii. *According to the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God.*

Tho', according to learned Expositors, by the *Blessed God*, be here meant the *Second Person* in the *Trinity*; yet granting, according to the Doctor, that it is to be understood of the *Father*, how doth it appear that this Epithet *Blessed* is generally, if not always, by way of Supreme Eminency, ascrib'd to the *Father*, when he ascribes the same to the *Son* at *b*?

408. 1 Joh. 2. 20. *But ye have an Unction from the Holy One.*

That this Epithet makes nothing for the Dr's Supremacy of the *Father* over the *Son*, see N^o 615, where *Christ* is stiled also *the Holy One*.

411. Jude 4. *Denying the only Lord God, [τὸ μόνον Δεσπότην Θεόν, God the only Supreme Governour,] and our Lord Jesus Christ.*

What

What Artifice doth the Dr. here use to get the *Son* out of the Godhead ! He is become a meer Slave to the *Arrian* Cause ! Here is *Roman, Italian, Greek, Parenthesis*, — and all will not do : as long as the Dr's *Boyle's Lectures* and *Paraphrases* are extant, he stands self-condemn'd. God is the only supreme Governour, true ; but then, as this learned Expositor says on *Joh. 1. 1.* with *God the Father*, in the *Unity* of the same Infinite Essence, from all Eternity, co-existed *God the Son* ; and therefore the Supremacy of the *Father* doth not hinder the Supremacy of the *Son*, but necessarily includes it. Besides (as I have said in my Preface) this Text doth not belong to the Person of the *Father*, but of the *Son*.

Jude 25. To the Only Wife God, &c. 412.

This, as excluding the *Son*, is contrary to *b, e, h, and i* ; and to *Nº 566, 625, 644. Script. Doctr.*

Rev. 1. 8. I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, saith the Lord, &c. 414.

From this Text he labours tooth and nail to set aside the *Son's Divinity*, by endeavouring to prove the Person of the *Father* alone Omnipotent ; in favour of which impious and blasphemous Notion, he produces two *Fathers* who never said any such thing, but quite the contrary, and, if living, would disown the *Dogma*. They indeed speak often of One supreme God, *ὁ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὁ πᾶσι*, but never of One Person supreme over all, excluding the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*. And

they often speak of one *Jesus Christ*, who was sent, but then 'tis with respect to his *Mediatorship* or *Humanity*; as any one may see that will give himself Time to read over those *Fathers*, and not content himself with Scraps pick'd out here and there, without regarding their *Coherence* and *Connexion*, or their *Occasion* and *Design* of their being written: which is neither fair nor honest. I am sorry to take notice of another gross piece of *Insincerity* which, in supporting this Notion of his, he's guilty of: He brings in *Polycarp* at his *Martyrdom* thus addressing himself to God, *Κύριε ὁ Ἰησοῦς Πατριάρχης*, &c. — which *Κύριε* he will have to be the Person of the *Father* only, exclusive of the *Son*, and so would make the World believe that *Polycarp* had as mean an Opinion of the *Son* as himself: But had he been ingenuous, he would have quoted all the Prayer, which speaks quite contrary to what he would have it; for at the latter end we find these words, viz. * *Te benedico, Tibi serviens, qui me dignum hac passione duxisti, ut percipiam partem, coronamq, Martyrii, initium Calicis, per Jesum Christum, in Unitate Spiritus Sancti — ob hanc rem te benedico in omnibus & glorior, per aeternum Pontificem, Omnipotentem Jesum Christum: — Amen.* But strange! that these words, *I am Alpha and Omega*, &c. should prove the *Father* alone Omnipotent, when the same words are quoted of the *Son*, Part 1. Cap. 2. § 3. N^o 686. So that if they make the *Father* alone Omnipotent, those make the *Son* alone Omnipotent; which proves nothing

* *Acta Martyr.* p. 33, cited by Dr. *Allix*, in his Answer to Mr. *Whiston's* Reply, p. 67.

thing at all, or more than the Dr. would have them. But stranger still! that from these or any other words he should argue the Person of the *Father* alone Omnipotent, when in his *Demonstr. B. and Attr. of God* at *a*, in his *Evid. of Nat. and Rev. Relig.* at *b*, and in his *Paraph. on Job. i. i.* at *e*, he asserts their Equality!— I cannot forbear applying the Saying of a great Casuist (upon another occasion) to him; *Non memini — uspiam me observasse tanto cum conatu & molimine meras nugas agi.* —

Rev. 6. 10. *How long, O Lord, Holy* 420
and True, [Gr. ὁ Θεωτάτος ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ὁ ἀληθινός, O Thou that art the supreme Governour, Holy and True.]

If we believe Dr. *Clark*, these words cannot be spoke *Εἰς ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ υἱοῦ*, by way of excluding the *Son*; and yet the Dr. would have them understood so. Which way shall we take him then? Why, the safest way is, to take him where he is orthodox: They must be understood then in opposition to Idolatry; for, *Acts 3. 14.* he allows the *Son* to be stiled *τὸν ἅγιον, The Holy One.* And in his *Paraphr. on Job. i. i.* at *e*, he asserts them to be *One* in Nature and Essence; and if they be *One*, &c. then cannot the *Father* be the supreme Governour, Holy and True, separate from the *Son*.

Rev. 11. 13. *And gave Glory to the God* 421
of Heaven.

— Here is no mention made of the Person of the *Father*, but only *The God of Heaven*; how the

the Dr. then can confine it to the *Father*, exclusive of the *Son*, I cannot conceive. I am sure he contradicts himself, not only in his Paraphr. on *Joh. 1. 1.* at *e*, but his *Nat. and Rev. Relig.* at *b*, where he says the *Son* is *God over all, blessed for ever*: And if so, then of Heaven.

433. Rev. 16. 11. *And blasphemed the God of Heaven.*

See above, N^o 426.

434. Rev. 16. 14. *The great Day of God Almighty, &c.*

435. Rev. 19. 7. — *Alleluia, for the Lord Omnipotent, &c.*

See above, N^o 414.

439. Rev. 21. 6. *I am Alpha and Omega.*

See above, 414.

§ 4.
447. Luke 4. 8. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

If this Text be spoke in reference to the Person of the *Father* only, and not in opposition to those which by Nature are not Gods, (as is the Opinion of all the Learned, that it is) in vain do we cry out against the Church of *Rome* for Idolatry. But in this *Lord God* is included the *Son*; as the Dr. says in his Paraphrase on *Joh. 1. 1.* at *e*: And therefore this Text proves nothing what he would have it.

Acts 4. 24, 30. *They lift up their Voice 457.*
to God, saying, Lord, Thou art God;—
grant that — *Wonders may be done by the*
Name of thy Holy Child Jesus.

See above, N^o 65.

Gal. 1. 5. *To whom be Glory for ever 472.*
and ever, Amen.

This Doxology the Dr. would have paid to
the *Father* only; thereby depriving the *Son* of
the Glory which, he says himself, in his *Nat.*
and *Rev. Rel.* at *b*, he was Partaker of before
the World was.

Phil. 2. 11. *And that every Tongue should 486.*
confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the
glory of God the Father.

This the Dr. brings to prove the *Son* infe-
riour to the *Father*; but let us compare this
with his other Quotations, and we shall see it
proves no such thing: For N. 9. he (as he
rightly quotes) says, — *but God is one*; which
one God, at N. 447, is stiled *Lord*, and at 457.
Now if this *one God* (according to the Dr.) be
mention'd with the Appellation *Lord*, and
Lord be an uncommunicable term, (as * he * See
would have it) then, when *Lord* is apply'd to N. 2.
the *Son*, as here, he must be that *one God*. So
that this Text is not to be understood exclu-
sive of the *Son*, but quite the contrary; in as
much as 'tis for the Glory of the *Father*, that
he be acknowledg'd in the Godhead of his *Son*.

1 Thes. 3. 11. *Now God himself and our 495.*
Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct
our way unto you. This

This distinction of Persons doth not infer a distinction of the Godhead, but rather quite the contrary; for the Apostle is here wishing that God may assist and direct him safely to the *Thessalonians*: He first applies to God, and then desires the guidance of both the Person of the *Father* and of the *Son* in that Godhead. And this the Dr. has been forc'd to own, when he has said, that the Unity of God is an Unity of Nature or Essence, &c. See *a*.

00. 1 Tim. 2. 5. *For there is one God, and one Mediator, &c.*

The Unity of the Godhead doth not exclude a diversity of Persons; neither doth distinction of Offices break the Unity of the Godhead; and if the Dr. means (for by this Text he would argue a Superiority on the *Father's* side) that the *Father* is superiour to the *Son*, consider'd under the relation of a *Mediator*, he is right in his notion; but if that he's superiour to him, consider'd in himself as *Son*, without any of those relations which he bears to us, 'tis absolutely false, and contradictory to his Doctrine at *a*, and his Paraphrase at *e*; which see.

02. 1 Tim. 3. 5. *Trusteth in God, &c.*

And in trusting in God, trusteth in *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*; or else that Unity of Essence is destroy'd which the Dr. has asserted at *a* and *e*.

03. 1 Tim. 6. 15. *The Blessed and ONLY Potentate.*

See N. 13.

Jude

Jude 25. *To the only wise God our Sa- 520.*
viour, &c.

See N^o 11.

Rev. 4. 8. *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God 521.*
Almighty, *which was, and is, and is to come.*

This Doxology is taken out of *Isa. 6. 3.* and denotes the whole Trinity of Persons in an Unity of Essence; as I have shew'd in my Note under *a*, p. 2. Almighty then cannot refer to God, consider'd as one Person, viz. the *Father*; but consider'd under a complex Notion, viz. of a Trinity in Unity, explain'd by the Doxology *Holy, holy, holy*, — immediately going before it. And this must be the sense of it, if the Dr. will stand to what he has said at *a* and *e*; which see.

Rev. 15. 3. — Lord God Almighty: — 527.

See N^o 414.

Rev. 22. 9. *See thou do it not — wor- 532.*
ship God.

A body would think this learned Dr. was writing against Praying to Saints and Angels, and not against the Trinity; for I am sure the Words seem rather directed against *that* than *this*. The Angel here charges *John* not to worship *him*, but *God*; but how the Dr. comes to understand the Angel's Mind so far, as to know that he meant by *God* only the Person of the *Father*, to me is a Mystery; and I am sure [as far as any moral Certainty will go] that the Angel [which knew the Will of the *Father*] did not mean, that *John* should worship *Him* exclusive of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*: And if the Dr. thinks he did, he contradicts

E

his

his Paraphrase on *Joh. 1. 1.* where he has laid down such an Unity betwixt the *Father* and *Son*, as 'tis impossible to worship one without the other: and on *Joh. 5. 3.* where he says, 'tis the Will of the *Father*, that the *Son* should have the same Honour paid him with himself. Which see at *k.*

Chap. II. Of the Son of God.

- § 1.
533. Matt. 1. 23. — God with us.
 534. Luk. 1. 16. — to the Lord their God. —
 537. Joh. 20. 28. *And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.*
 539. Rom. 9. 5. *Who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen.*
 540. 1 Tim. 3. 16. *God was manifested in the Flesh, &c.*
 542. Heb. 1. 8. — Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.

Now compare all these places with p. 6, 7. *Script. Doct.* N^o 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15. and you will see that those places were not meant exclusive of the *Son*, as the Dr. would have 'em. For if there be but one God, as most certainly there is, I would fain ask the Dr. how he can reconcile these places together; unless the *Son* be God in the Unity of the same Essence with the *Father*: as he says he is at *e.*

535. Joh. 1. 1. — and the Word was God.

The Dr's Exposition on this is; That the *Word* is a Person deriving from the *Father* both his Being itself, and incomprehensible Power and Knowledge, and other *Divine Attributes*

tributes and Authority, &c. which is directly contrary to his Paraphrase on *Joh. 3. 32.* at *h*, and on *ver. 34.* at *i*.

§ 3.

Joh. 10. 30. I and my Father are ONE. 594.

The Dr. endeavours to mollifie this Text by a cooling Comment; and tells you, that the meaning is only that, since none can pluck them out of the *Father's* hands, and the *Father* has communicated his Power to the *Son*, therefore none can pluck them out of the *Son's* hands: So that being in the *Father's* hands, or being in the *Son's* hands, is *one and the same thing*. A body would really think that the Dr. was not *one* and the *same* Man with himself; for this is a gross abuse of the Text, and his Paraphrase upon it is most just, sound, and orthodox; which see at *l*.

Joh. 5. 23. That all Men should honour 689.
the *Son*, even as they honour the *Father*.

EVEN here denotes the quantity and equality of Worship, and doth not signifie ALSO; which is a most gross Contradiction to that Sence of it he has given at *k*.

§ 5.

In this Section the learned Dr. rallies up all his Forces to prove the *Son* subordinate to the *Father*; but is so unlucky as to pick out only such Texts as speak the *Son* inferiour to the *Father*, with respect either to his Manhood or Mediatorship; and which he has happen'd to answer almost *totidem verbis* himself: and accordingly he begins with

756. Mat. 7. 21. — *but he that doth the Will of MY FATHER* —

From this place he makes the *Son* inferiour to the *Father*, because he speaks of acting in conformity to his *Will*: But I always thought, according to the poor notion I ever had of *Metaphysicks*, that from an Unity of Nature and Essence there must of necessity arise an Unity of Will; so that if the *Father* and *Son* be one in Nature and Essence, they must in course conspire together in a sameness of Will. That they are one in Nature and Essence, the Dr. has expressly taught in his Paraphrase on *Joh. 1. 1.* at *e*: Besides, he says on *Joh. 10. 30.* that they are one in Will; and therefore the *Father's Will* must be the *Son's Will*, & *vice versa*: So this proves nothing.

757. Mat. 10. 40. *He that receiveth Me, receiveth him that sent Me.*

From the *Son's* being sent, the Dr. would infer his subordination to the *Father*; but his Paraphrase on *Joh. 3. 34.* speaks quite another thing; which see at *i*.

773. Mark 13. 32. *But of that Day and Hour knoweth no Man; no, not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.*

These words carrying something of Obscurity in 'em, the Dr. has illustrated them with two Comments; the one out of *Irenaeus*, the other out of *Basil*: Than the first of which, he says, there can be no better; (I presume because it seems (and only seems) to favour his Notion) and the latter, he says, is remarkable: and (in my opinion) better than the
for-

former. But a better than 'em both, and what comes nearest the Sence of 'em, is his own Comment; which utterly destroys the Purpose of this Text, that was to prove the Son inferior to the Father. See his words at *d*.

Luk. 4. 18. *He hath sent me to heal, &c.* 776.

— 43. *For therefore am I sent.* 777.

Luk. 10. 16. *He that despiseth Me, despiseth him that sent Me.* 778.

Joh. 3. 17. *God sent his Son.* 781.

For all these, see his Paraphrase on Joh. 3. 34. at *d*.

Joh. 3. 32. *And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth.* 782.

The Dr. has very fairly here hook'd himself into a mortifying *Dilemma*; that either his Paraphrase upon these words must be false, (which see at *b*) or else the words themselves prove nothing what he would have 'em.

Joh. 4. 34. *My Meat is to do the Will of him that sent me, and to finish his Work.* 785.

Joh. 5. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himself, &c.* 786.

— 30. *I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge, &c.* 790.

This is all very true; the Son can do, judge, will nothing of himself, *i. e.* separately from the Father; because they being *One in Nature and Essence*, as he says at *e*, and *in Will*, as at *l*, every *Action, Volition, and Judgment* of the Son must be jointly the *Action, Volition, and Judgment* of the Father: And therefore, according to

to himself, these Texts do not prove the Son's Inferiority to the Father.

817. Joh. 10. 29. *My Father, which gave them me, is greater than All.*

But not greater than *himself*; because as God, he is the same and *One* with him. See *e* and *l*.

841. Joh. 17. 5. *And now, O Father, glorifie thou me with thine own self; with the Glory which I had with Thee before the World was.*

The Dr. is so unreasonable as to deny the Son that Glory which he has had from all Eternity with the Father; and which he himself pays him in his Paraphrase, at *k*.

931. Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is — One Spirit, — One Lord, — One God and Father of all, who is above all.*

Who can any longer doubt but that the Dr's Design is in opposition to the *Athanasian Creed*, to set up Three distinct Beings for so many Gods; two of which, the *Spirit* and the *Lord*, he would have to be subordinate ones, and the *Father* to be supreme. But fair and softly, — He says at *b*, that the Son is *God over All Blessed for ever*; how then is the Father above all, exclusive of the Son? And, how is the *Spirit* inferiour to either, when the Holy Scriptures, in a place he has quoted, N. 1126, stile him *God*? And lastly, How can they be three distinct Essences; when he says at *a*, that the different Persons in the Trinity co-exist in an Unity of Nature or Essence? But thus —

The Texts of Scripture quoted throughout this Section, are to prove the *Holy Spirit* subordinate to the *Father*; which he manages after the same unfair manner, as he doth those he uses to prove the Inferiority of the *Son*; and, as he construes them, are inconsistent with his Doctrine at *a* and *c*.

Page 303, § 32.

The word, *God*, in Scripture, no where signifies the Person of the *Holy Ghost*.

This the Dr. affirms with as little Consideration as Truth; for, at N^o 1126. he quotes a place where he is stiled *God*.

Page 304, § 33.

The word *God*, in Scripture, never signifies a complex Notion of *more Persons than One*.

See *Gen. 1.* quoted p. 3. of the Preface.

Page 322, § 36.

The *SON* — in this whole Dispensation, in the Creation and Redemption of the World, acts in all things according to the *Will*, and by the *Mission* or *Authority of the Father*.

This is a sort of Recapitulation from the whole, and shews what the Dr. drives at: But for this see above, N. 790.

Page 342, § 43.

Upon these Grounds, *absolutely supreme Honour* is due to the Person of the *Father* singly, &c.

This

This Assertion is both false and inconsistent with his Paraphrase on *Job. 5. 23* ; which see at *k.*

And now, I think, we have had enough of this great Dr's Contradictions. His treatment of the *Liturgy* (which is very abominable) I shall leave to abler and better Pens ; and conclude all with that Advice to him, which he gives to the learned *Mr. Dodwell*.

And now, Sir, I cannot but earnestly recommend it again to your most serious Consideration : whether the New and Inconsiderate Notions which you have advanc'd ; and (the Arguments I will not say, because I think you have not offer'd any of any real force, but) the Pretences of Scripture and Authority, which you have put into the Hands of Sceptical and Prophane Men, to confirm them in their Prejudices against the Belief of a *Trinity in Unity*, and an *Unity in Trinity*, are not likely to be of great *disservice* to Religion. And, whether you ought not (as all good Men are of opinion that you ought) to think of some Means of making Satisfaction to the *Church*, to which you have given so great Offence ; and of preventing the *Effect* of that *Encouragement*, which your *Notions* in this Matter have afforded *Immorality* and *Contempt of Religion*.

4 OC 58

FINIS.